

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 22, 2006 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 190032006). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 17-20 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 1-16 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for holding that claims 17-20 are allowed. Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the Office Action. However, Applicants will point out that the reasons for allowability of the above referenced claims are not limited to the reasons for allowance as set forth in the Office Action.

Prior Art Rejections

The First 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection

Claims 1, 11, 15, 6, 2, 7, 12, 16, 3, 8, 13, 5, 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ma et al (US 6954463 B1). As mentioned above, claims 1, 11, 15, 6, 2, 7, 12, 16, 3, 8, 13, 5, 10 are being cancelled, and therefore this rejection is moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection


Claims 4, 9, 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ma in view of Comstock (US 642920 B1). As mentioned above, claims 4, 9, 14 are being cancelled, and therefore this rejection is moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Stanley P. Fisher

Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez

Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

July 13, 2006

SPF/JCM/YM